

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 8-10 are pending in the application. In the non-final Office Action dated May 2, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *O'Shea* (U.S. 6,189,045). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and addresses the Examiner's disposition below. Claims 5, 10, and 11 have been amended.

Independent claims 1, 5, 10, and 11 each claim subject matter relating to asynchronously receiving a plurality of data instances, each data instance having one of a plurality of formats. A datatype of a first format is provided for each data instance, each datatype having a reference in the first format to the respective data instance, the data instances being maintained separately from the datatypes.

This is clearly unlike *O'Shea*, which fails to disclose or suggest a datatype having a reference in a first format to a respective data instance that is maintained separately from the datatype. *O'Shea* describes a system in which a publisher provides data, such as a text message in a first language. The message is converted to another language or datatype, as specified by a recipient. Thus, the message that is received by the recipient includes the data in a different format.

Unlike Applicant's claimed invention, *O'Shea*'s datatype that is received at the recipient does not include a reference to the data, but instead includes a translated version of the data. The Examiner argues that *O'Shea* teaches a database of datatypes, and the databases include references to data instances. *Office Action of 5/22/2007*, page 5. However, this is unlike Applicant's claimed invention. Applicant's claimed invention claims a datatype that includes a reference to a data instance that is maintained separately from the datatype. To the contrary, *O'Shea* merely teaches that its databases include references to data instances. Nowhere does *O'Shea* teach or suggest a datatype having a reference in a first format to a respective data instance that is maintained separately from the datatype.

For at least these reasons, *O'Shea* fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 5, 10, and 11.

Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, and 9 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 or 5 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 5 are allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 8-10 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


(Reg. No. 45,034)
Christopher P. Rauch
SONNENSCHEIN, NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box #061080
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
Telephone 312/876-2606
Customer #58328
Attorneys for Applicant(s)